

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

CLOANTO CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HYPERION ENTERTAINMENT CVBA,

Defendant.

Case No. C18-381RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs Cloanto Corporation, Amiga, Inc., Itec, LLC, and Amino Development Corporation's Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt. #143. On March 30, 2023, the Court issued an Order denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. #100), granting Defendant Hyperion Entertainment C.V.B.A. ("Hyperion")'s Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. #105), and dismissing Plaintiffs' claims in their Second Amended Complaint. Dkt. #141. On April 13, 2023, Plaintiffs filed this Motion seeking reconsideration of the Court's Order dismissing the First, Second, Third, and Eighth Causes of Action in the Second Amended Complaint on the basis of manifest error. Dkt. #143.

"Motions for reconsideration are disfavored." LCR 7(h)(1). "The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing

1 of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with  
2 reasonable diligence.” *Id.* “The motion shall point out with specificity the matters which the  
3 movant believes were overlooked or misapprehended by the court, any new matters being  
4 brought to the court’s attention for the first time, and the particular modifications being sought  
5 in the court’s prior ruling.” LCR 7(h)(2). No response to a motion for reconsideration shall be  
6 filed unless requested by the court. LCR 7(h)(3).  
7

8 The Court has determined that a response brief is unnecessary.

9 The Court relies on its prior findings from Dkt. #141, incorporated herein. Plaintiffs  
10 argue that the Court’s Order contradicts its prior May 16, 2019, Order (Dkt. #69), granting in  
11 part and denying in part Defendant Hyperion’s Motion to Dismiss, and would produce absurd  
12 results that parties to the Settlement Agreement at the heart of this case did not intend. Dkt. #143.  
13 The Court finds that its orders are not contradictory and that these issues were already addressed  
14 and decided in the Court’s Order. *See e.g.*, Dkt. #141 at 6–8. Accordingly, the Court finds that  
15 Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate any manifest error in the prior ruling or new facts or legal  
16 authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.  
17 Accordingly, this Motion will be denied.  
18  
19

20 Having considered the briefing from the parties and the remainder of the record, the Court  
21 hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration, Dkt. #143, is DENIED.  
22 This case remains CLOSED.  
23

24 DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2023.

25  
26 

27 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE